HEADQUARTERS NEWS LETTER

NATIONAL·AMERICAN·WOMAN·SUFFRAGE·ASSOCIATION

171 . MADISON · AVE. NEW · YORK · CITY

VOLUME II NUMBER II

FEBRUARY · 15 · 1916

MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT
President of the National American Woman Suffrage Association

JAN 30 1917

HEADQUARTERS NEWS LETTER

A printed attempt to maintain intimate contact between the National American Woman Suffrage Association and its thousands of members throughout the country.

Published once a month by the National American Woman Suffrage Association, at 171 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. Subscription price per year 25c.

Entered as second class matter Oct. 6, 1915, at Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.

—:o:—

National American Woman Suffrage Association

Honorary President
DR. ANNA HOWARD SHAW

President
MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

1st Vice-President
MRS. FRANK M. ROESSING

2nd Vice President
MRS. STANLEY MCCORMICK

3rd Vice-President
MISS ESTHER G. OGDEN

Recording Secretary
MRS. JAMES W. MORRISSON

Corresponding Secretary
MISS HANNAH J. PATTERSON

Treasurer
MRS. HENRY WADE ROGERS

1st Auditor
MRS. WALTER MCNAB MILLER

2nd Auditor
MRS. PATTIE RUFFNER JACOBS

Congressional Committee

Headquarters:
Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

—:o:—

ILLINOIS LEADS.

From the Atlantic to the Pacific the call has gone forth for the suffragists of the nation to arise and unite in so strong an appeal to Congress for a Federal Amendment that it may not be gainsaid. The great Congressional Campaign launched under the auspices of the National Association is now under way. On February 3rd, Illinois held in the city of Chicago the first Congressional Conference and now enjoys the distinction of leading the long procession of states that will respond to the bugle call of duty.

Enthusiasm and determination marked this first gathering of suffragists to plan for Congressional activity. And so great was their zeal that it was communicated to other women not members of the National sisterhood, so that all the women's organizations of Illinois have pledged themselves to assist in the work under the leadership of the State Association. A great woman's parade is planned to take place on June 7th, the date of the Republican Convention. In this will march all the women's political associations as suffragists, without regard to party affiliations. Mrs. Harrison Monro Brown, President of the Illinois Woman Suffrage Association, will act as chairman of the Parade Committee and she will be assisted by others prominent in the city and the state.

Mrs. Catt, who is devoting her splendid energies to the Congressional Campaign, was able to attend this first conference, to make an inspiring speech and give much sage counsel. Her slogan, "Suffrage First," has been taken up with ardor by congressional campaigners in Illinois, and it probably will be the most popular phrase of the year, as the National leader goes from state to state presenting plans, directing activities and stimulating the energies of her big working army.

PROGRESS OF THE SUSAN B. ANTHONY AMENDMENT

KNOWN IN THE

64TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES AS

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 1

Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States Conferring upon Women the Right of Suffrage.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several states as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

History of Amendment.

First introduced in the Senate, January 10, 1878 by Senator A. A. Sargent, of California.

REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE:

In the Senate:

1878, Adverse majority.
1882, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1884, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1886, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1889, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1890, Without recommendation.
1893, Favorable majority, adverse minority.
1896, Without recommendation.
1912, Favorable majority.
1914, Favorable majority.
1916, Favorable majority.

VOTED UPON IN THE SENATE:

January 25, 1887, yeas 16, nays 34.
March 19, 1914, yeas 35, nays 34.

IN THE HOUSE REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE:

1883, Favorable majority.
1884, Adverse majority, favorable minority.
1886, Adverse majority, favorable minority.
1890, Favorable majority.
1894, Adverse majority.
1914, Without recommendation.

VOTED UPON IN THE HOUSE,

January 12,1915; yeas 174, nays 204.

Introduced in the 64th Congress

IN THE SENATE,

December 7, 1915, by Senator Sutherland, of Utah, and Senator Thomas, of Colorado.
Referred in the Senate to Committee on Woman Suffrage.
Reported in the Senate on January 8, with a favorable recommendation.

IN THE HOUSE,

December 6, 1915, by Representatives Raker, Mondell, Keating, Taylor and Hayden.
Referred in the House to the Judiciary Committee, and by it to its sub-committee No. 1.
Reported to the Judiciary Committee by the sub-committee on February 9, 1916, with recommendation that the Judiciary Committee report it to the House without recommendation.

Status:

IN THE SENATE,

On the calendar awaiting action.

IN THE HOUSE,

In the Judiciary Committee.

THE CONGRESSIONAL WORK IN WASHINGTON.

With the opening of the 64th Congress on December 6th, there came the next opportunity for pushing the work of the National Association for the Susan B. Anthony amendment. In the Senate, on December 7th, there was introduced the resolution proposing this amendment by Senator Sutherland, at the request of the Congressional Union, and by Senator Thomas, at the request of the National Association. Both were referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage, of which Senator Thomas is chairman. This committee consists of the following members, a majority of whom are strong suffragists, so that it was not a surprise to have the resolution reported favorably out of their committee on January 8:

Senator Charles S. Thomas, of Colorado, chairman; Senator Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma; Senator Joseph E. Ransdell, of Louisiana; Senator Henry F. Hollis, of New Hampshire; Senator Ed. S. Johnson, of South Dakota; Senator George Sutherland, of Utah; Senator Wesley L. Jones, of Washington; Senator Moses E. Clapp, of Minnesota; Senator Thomas B. Catron, of New Mexico.

Since the two resolutions were identical, the committee deemed it expedient to report the one first introduced, carrying Senator Sutherland's name. The report which Senator Thomas, as chairman, made to the Senate when he announced the action of the committee, is such a strong endorsement of woman suffrage, as well as the federal amendment, that if there is space I shall ask the editor of the News Letter to print the report in full in this issue. The amendment is now on the calendar in the Senate awaiting action. The time for the vote has not been set, but it may come soon.

In the House of Representatives this same resolution has been introduced by at least half a dozen members, among them Representatives Raker, Mondell, Keating, Taylor and Hayden. It was immediately reported to the Judiciary Committee of the House, which consists of the following men:

Edwin Y. Webb, of North Carolina; Charles C. Carlin, of Virginia; Robert Y. Thomas, Jr., of Kentucky; H. Garland Dupré, of Louisiana; Joseph Taggart, of Kansas; William L. Igoe, of Missouri; Warren Gard, of Ohio; W. E. Williams, of Illinois; Richard S. Whaley, of South Carolina; M. M. Neeley, of West Virginia; Harry H. Dale, of New York; Thaddeus H. Caraway, of Arkansas; Henry J. Steele, of Pennsylvania; Andrew J. Volstead, of Minnesota; John M. Nelson, of Wisconsin; Dick T. Morgan, of Oklahoma; Henry G. Danforth, of New York; George S. Graham, of Pennsylvania; Walter M. Chandler, of New York; Leonidas C. Dyer, of Missouri; Hunter H. Moss, Jr., of West Virginia.

The Judiciary Committee has referred the measure to its sub-committee Number 1, constituted of the following members:

Charles C. Carlin, of Virginia, Chairman; Joseph Taggart, of Kansas; William Gard, of Ohio; Richard S. Whaley, of South Carolina; Andrew J. Volstead, of Minnesota; John M. Nelson, of Wisconsin; Dick T. Morgan, of Oklahoma.

On February 9, this sub-committee by a vote of 4 to 3 voted to recommend to the Judiciary Committee that our resolution be reported to the House without recommendation. Those voting in favor were Messrs. Taggart, Volstead, Nelson, and Morgan; against Messrs. Carlin, Gard and Whaley. The measure is therefore again in the hands of the Judiciary Committee. Suffragists, both men and women, are urged to send letters to the members of the Committee asking for a favorable report on the resolution.

Congressional Committee: The members of the Congressional Committee for this year, in addition to the chairman, are: Mrs. Antoinette Funk, of Illinois and Miss Mary Garrett Hay, of New York, Vice-Chairmen; Mrs. Pattie Ruffner Jacobs, of Alabama; Mrs. Helen Grenfell, of Colorado; Mrs T. T. Cotnam, of Arkansas; Mrs. C. S. McClure, of Michigan and Miss Martha Norris, of Ohio. These members will come to Washington from time to time to assist with the lobby work. Mrs. Funk and your chairman will continue to be here constantly.

In accordance with the report made to the Convention by the committee appointed to confer with a committee of the Congressional Union, in which report it was recommended that the National Board should consider the advisability of conferring with the Congressional Union in regard to the lobby work at Washington, Mrs. Catt and I have held one conference with Miss Anne Martin, the chairman of the legislative committee of the Congressional Union. Our policies and our methods of work are as distinct as ever from those of the Congressional Union, but these conferences will probably be held from time to time, since a conflict on the program for getting the federal amendment through Congress would mean certain defeat.

It will be recalled that when the measure was before the Senate in March, 1914, the Congressional Union desired a further delay on the vote, whereas the National Congressional Committee feared that the measure might be side-tracked because of the pressure of other business if delayed too long. When the debate on the measure began, therefore, the Congressional Committee agreed upon a vote at the conclusion of the debate. On the other hand, the Congressional Union began having telegrams sent to the Senators protesting against the vote being taken. A repetition of such opposition within the suffrage ranks will obviously be disastrous.

The conferences therefore concern the work of the lobby only, and will attempt to minimize the disadvantage to suffrage in Congress of having two lobbies working independently of each other.

On January 24th, Senator Norris, of Nebraska, introduced a resolution in the Senate providing for the direct election of the President and Vice-President of the United States. For many years there has been agitation in behalf of such a bill. The present method of having the voters select presidential electors, resulting in the system known as the electoral college, has long been considered cumbersome. Senator Norris's Bill was therefore welcomed in many circles.

This measure is particularly pertinent because a presidential election will be held this year, at which almost two million new women voters will make

their party affiliations. Your Congressional Committee, therefore, carefully scrutinized the resolution, and uncovered the following situation:

In the states in which women vote upon the same terms as men Senator Norris's bill would be satisfactory. In the one state in the Union, Illinois, where the women have the presidential suffrage without having full suffrage, they hold their presidential franchise by enactment of the legislature. Senator Norris's resolution takes away from the legislatures the power to establish the qualifications for the presidential franchise, and in wiping out this power would thereby rob the women of Illinois of their presidential vote.

Mrs. Funk and your chairman immediately brought this matter to the attention of Senator Norris, who stated that he would make a revision of the measure.

"I shall redraft my resolution so that it will preserve the presidential vote for the women of Illinois," said Senator Norris. "The last thing I should wish to do would be to deprive them of any of their qualifications as voters. Indeed, if I had my way, I would increase them and extend the franchise to all women."

We further pointed out to Senator Norris that his resolution, as presented, would prevent women from securing the presidential vote by state legislative enactments in the future. The Senator also agreed in his revision to add a proviso to protect women who might hereafter secure such franchise.

Of course, Senator Norris's resolution, like our own Susan B. Anthony resolution, necessitates an amendment to the Constitution. It therefore must secure a two-thirds favorable vote in both branches of Congress, and thereafter be ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the states. The measure is now in the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

The National Congressional Committee feels justified in thus watching the so-called direct presidential election resolution, since we deem that the National Association would wish us to take such steps as would prevent the loss of any franchise which the women in this country already possess. Furthermore, because this is a presidential election year, the vote of the Illinois women is of particular political value in our work on the Anthony amendment. Every active suffragist knows that in lobbying with Senators and Congressmen one needs to present not only the suffrage phase of our question but the matter of political expediency.

Senator Norris is a strong suffragist and will undoubtedly make a revision of his resolution which will be entirely satisfactory. Your Congressional Committee will keep the matter closely in hand, and will make further report in case of any change.

On February 15th your committee will move into new offices in the Munsey Building. We had hoped to be able to secure headquarters having a room on the street floor, but have been unable to find a desirable place at this season of the year. The work will be continued in the Munsey Building.

JENNIE BRADLEY ROESSING.
(Mrs. Frank M. Roessing.)

CONFERENCES THAT ARE COMING.

Following close upon the Congressional Conference of Illinois, New York and Massachusetts will hold their meetings the latter part of this month. February 24th, at the Harris Theatre, in New York City, delegates from the 43 congressional districts of the Empire State will meet to make their plans for working for the Federal Amendment. February 25th and 26th, Massachusetts suffragists will convene in Boston for a similar conference. Maine will follow their admirable example on the 28th and 29th, calling her congressional delegates to Portland. Conferences that will take place at earlier dates are those of Rhode Island (Feb. 17th), and Connecticut (Feb. 21st.)

New Hampshire will start the month of March right with a conference on the 1st and 2nd, in Manchester, and other states that will follow are Ohio, with Columbus and March 20th and 21st as the place and dates, Michigan on the 22nd and 23rd, Wisconsin on the 24th and 25th and Kentucky on the 27th and 28th. The earlier the conference, the quicker the suffragists in the various states can get to work on bringing pressure to bear on Congress in behalf of the amendment and the greater the chance of success. All honor then to these states that are responding so promptly to the call to action.

—:o:—

SUFFRAGE COURSES FOR ALL.

The Educational Section of the N. Y. State Woman Suffrage Party will conduct a Training School for Suffragists at 303 Fifth Avenue, from February 15th to March 30th. A Supporting Membership Fee of $3.00 or $5.00 will entitle anyone to attend the classes of this school and also to attend all meetings given by the Educational Section for the year ending November 1st, 1916. Classwork privileges are granted to anyone paying either amount, but for $5.00 one has the privilege of bringing a guest four times during the session. Anyone taking all six courses and passing a successful test will be given a certificate.

The courses are as follows:

SUFFRAGE HISTORY AND ARGUMENT, given by Miss Louise Grant.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND POLITICAL METHOD, given by Mr. Arthur MacMahon.

ECONOMICS, given by Mrs. Jessica G. Cosgrove.

PARLIAMENTARY LAW, given by Mrs. Urquhart Lee.

ORGANIZATION, given by Mrs. Arthur L. Livermore and Mrs. Jas. Lees Laidlaw.

PUBLIC SPEAKING, given by Mrs. Beatrice F. R. Hale.

SUFFRAGE HISTORY AND ARGUMENT.—This is fundamental. It gives the beginning and causes of the Suffrage Movement and carries its history to the present day. It takes up all the arguments intelligent suffragists should know.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT.—This explains the machinery and working of City, State and National Government, the origin and policies of political parties, and the method of making changes in our laws and political machinery. (Suffrage, economic legislation, etc.)

ECONOMICS.—This shows the economic basis of all democratic movements (like suffrage.) It shows how wealth is distributed and used, the production exchanged, and the reaction of each upon politics. Consequently, the close connection and interest of women in these questions.

PARLIAMENTARY LAW.—This will give women practical training in organizing and conducting meetings, in making clear reports, and otherwise improving their business efficiency.

ORGANIZATION AND SUFFRAGE ACTIVITIES.—This will give full and practical directions for organizing new districts, carrying on assembly district work, enrolling, canvassing, campaign work, etc., and for discovering and using all agencies that might help suffrage.

PUBLIC SPEAKING.—This will give practical training in suffrage speaking, with personal advice and criticism. It will prove invaluable for all who wish to acquire confidence and ease in speaking. All suffragists should be able to speak in private and in public, even though their main work may be in other directions.

Addresses will be made at the school by Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, Mrs. Raymond Brown, Mrs. Frederick Nathan, and Mrs. Norman deR. Whitehouse.

Applications and checks may be sent to Executive Secretary of N. Y. State Woman Suffrage Party, Room 2003, 303 Fifth Avenue., Telephone, Madison Square 4701.

A Correspondence Course for out-of-town suffragists is also offered by the Educational Section. This is also for the benefit of women who are detained at home and for those, who, for various reasons, cannot attend suffrage meetings. The course is free, but it is hoped that as many applicants as possible will send 25 cents in stamps to help pay for necessary expenses. Subscriptions to *Good Housekeeping* are offered as prizes to those who have the best examination papers. All good suffragists have an opportunity now to acquire accurate and thorough information about the cause they love and it is hoped that many will avail themselves of the privileges afforded.

—:o:—

CHANGE OF OFFICES FOR NATIONAL.

On account of the need for more space, the National will move about Feb. 15th to the Burrell Building, 171 Madison Avenue, corner of 33rd Street, New York City. Here on the 14th floor a pleasant suite of rooms has been secured. This change will bring the National Association nearer the big organizations affiliated with it. This will be convenient and will commend itself to visiting suffragists who like to call at all the headquarters and frequently are in town for but a few hours.

The National Woman Suffrage Publishing Company will also move to the new quarters and continue to pay its share of the rent. As the expenses of the National Association will not be increased to any extent, the officers are pleased with a change that must in the long run facilitate their work.

NEW YORK STATE SUFFRAGISTS.

With renewed enthusiasm and devotion, the members of the New York State Woman Suffrage Party have entered upon their work for the re-submission of the woman suffrage amendment in 1917.

Various headquarters are being opened throughout the State. In New York City the Recruiting Station at 663 Fifth Avenue is in full swing. There daily workers respond to the newly awakened public interest, which has been manifested ever since election day, as well as to the desire of the old suffragists for new work. Whether it be the reception tendered to our State Chairman, Mrs. Norman deR. Whitehouse, on Saturday, January 22nd, or a class for new speakers under the auspices of our Educational Section (the Equal Franchise Society); or an afternoon tea conference of some committee which is working on the great ball to be held at Madison Square Garden, on March 7th, which is in the hands of the Publicity Section of the New York State Woman Suffrage Party, with Mrs. John Blair in command; or whether it is just a busy afternoon of clerical work, the women are rallying to the Recruiting Station with that unique devotion and unselfish desire to serve so characteristic of the suffrage movement.

Delegations of suffragists are constantly going to Albany from all over the state as well as from New York City to keep in touch with the legislative situation. The interesting aspect of our approach to the Legislature this year is that there is very little argument on the suffrage question, but only on political and technical considerations in reference to the submission of the Amendment.

One by one the Assemblymen are coming to realize that there is no substantial objection to its re-submission; they are beginning to realize, in many cases to their surprise, how strong the organized movement is back of the re-submission. They are realizing that there is no strong organized demand against re-submission, while there is a stalwart and active organization backed by a tremendous public opinion in the electorate which is demanding the old American prerogative of the right to vote upon the measure themselves at a popular election.

(Signed) HARRIET BURTON LAIDLAW,
(Mrs. James Lees Laidlaw).
1st Vice-Chairman, N. Y. State Woman Suffrage Party.

—:o:—

NATIONAL AMERICAN WOMAN SUFFRAGE ASSOCIATION

171 Madison Avenue, N. Y.

Please find enclosed 25 cents in stamps to cover the cost of one year's subscription to the Headquarters News Letter to be published once a month.

Name.....

Address.....

.....

THE DATA DEPARTMENT.

MUST WOMEN VOTERS SERVE ON JURIES?

BY MARY SUMNER BOYD

In the last Nebraska campaign Representative Slabaugh speaking for the antis, made much of enforced jury service by women voters. The word *male* in the Nebraska Jury Law had been pointed out by women suffragists, but this gentleman held that "even where male appears, it would be stricken out in consonance with the spirit of woman suffrage. In all states where woman suffrage prevails women are compelled to serve on juries."

This is a stock contention of the antis wherever woman suffrage is agitated. Woman suffragists themselves have, for the most part, supposed that with the granting of political rights to women went the same civil responsibilities as were borne by the other half of the electorate. They have simply maintained that the discretionary power given to magistrates would prevent compulsory Jury Duty from bearing too heavily; that family duties and in some cases sex alone would be accepted as a sufficient excuse from service.

Most suffragists have assumed that women do actually serve on juries in all the suffrage states. As a matter of fact, in some of those states they do serve legally, in others they do not, and never have; and in still others they did so serve for a time, drawn by local magistrates actually in contravention of the law. Correspondence of this department with District Attorneys of the equal suffrage states has brought results that should effectually destroy the anti bugbear of enforced jury duty.

In only one equal suffrage state, Idaho, has the word man or male in the Jury Law been so interpreted as to force jury duty on women, and in this state, the compulsion is largely theoretical.

"Women are not excluded from jury duty," writes the Attorney General of Idaho, "either by constitutional provision or by statute, nor can they be exempt if they plead sex, and they may be forced to serve upon exactly the same terms as men. As to the proportion of women who serve on juries, I will say that *very rarely indeed do women serve*, and usually only in some case before the Justice of the Peace or Probate Judge, where the probabilities are that it will not be necessary for the jury to remain out for any length of time . . . *In practice, if summoned as jurors, it is more than likely that the Judge would accept an excuse and relieve them from duty.*"

There are only four other equal suffrage states in which women are even permitted to serve on jury. These are Kansas, Nevada, Utah and Washington. Of these, in Nevada no women have as yet been drawn.

"In Kansas," says the Attorney General, "*women are exempt if they plead sex.* However, they may serve, if they desire to and qualify." So willing have the women been to serve that they defeated a bill designed expressly to exempt them.

Such a bill as was defeated in Kansas has actually become law in Utah. The District Attorney writes: "There is nothing in the Constitution or laws of this State which would prevent a woman from acting as a juror, providing she is a citizen of the United States, over the age of twenty-one years, can read and write the English language, has the required statutory residence, is a tax-payer in the State and is of reputable sound mind and discretion, and not disabled in body so as to be unable to serve as such. *However, by a statute a female citizen is expressly exempt from jury duty. I have never known of women to be called for such service.*"

Washington, up to 1911, belonged to the largest group of equal suffrage states, those which exclude women from jury service. The decision of the Supreme Court of Washington (Harland *vs.* Territory, 13 Pac. 453) is quoted as final by the eight equal suffrage states which still do not allow women, as electors, to serve on jury, and maintain that special legislation is necessary to extend this right to them. In 1911 such legislation was passed in Washington and women now serve unless they wish to plead sex. Sec. 2, of the Jury Law of 1911 provides, however, that women "*shall not be compelled to serve.*"

As to the actual service of women on Washington juries the Attorney General has this to say: "We may say that our experience is that, although women are privileged to refuse to serve on juries, many of them do serve. We have no information at hand wherewith to make any reliable estimate of the actual proportion serving, but would guess roughly that about one-fourth of the jurors who serve are women."

Arizona, Alaska, Colorado and Montana have not "stricken out the word male in consonance with the spirit of woman suffrage." They have retained it in all its very special meaning in the Jury Law. For the common law word *homo* is only in this connection interpreted *male*. "Under the word *homo*," says Blackstone in explanation of the jury law, "though a word common to both sexes, the female is however excluded *propter defectum sexus*."

Profiting by the position taken in Washington these four states maintain that special legislation will be necessary to give woman voters the right to serve on jury. The Attorney Generals' statements follows:

Montana: "Women are not qualified as jurors in any case."

Colorado: "Only *men* are eligible for service on juries."

Arizona: "Our law does not provide for women serving on juries."

Alaska: "Women are excluded by the terms of the jury law."

It will come as a surprise to many that California, Wyoming, Illinois and Oregon, where women juries have actually tried cases, are also to be added to the number of equal suffrage states in which women are excluded from jury service.

The District Attorney of California and Illinois send this department copies of lengthy opinions given out for the instruction of District Attorneys on this point. These are based largely on the Harland decision. The general argument of the California official follows: "The amendment to the State Constitution granting the elective franchise to women dealt with their political rights and duties, and with them alone. *The constitutional amendment has no bearing on the rights of citizenship of women, but deals with their rights of suffrage only.* If the Statute which fixed the qualifications of jurors, intended to impose the duty of jury service upon women it was effective for that purpose at the time of its adoption in 1872, and the effect of the Statute is not changed by the constitutional amendment relating to suffrage. I am of the opinion that it was the intention of the Legislature to follow the commonly accepted custom and usage in this regard, and that consequently it was not intended to impose the duty of jury service upon women, and that, without express legislation to that effect, they are not qualified to act as such."

In regard to the cases of women jurors, who in the early days of woman suffrage did actually sit at San Mateo and other places, the Attorney General of California has this to say: "In various instances women have sat upon juries in this state, but as heretofore said it is the opinion of this office that under the laws of this State women are not qualified to sit as jurors."

Since the rendition of his opinion, attempts have been made by women to meet their handicap—*defectum sexus!*—by appropriate legislation in the last session of the California legislature; but these attempts have so far been unsuccessful.

The District Attorney of Illinois has also delivered a lengthy opinion adverse to women jurors without special legislation. This opinion is based on somewhat the same grounds as in California. But since suffrage was given in Illinois by legislation and not by amendment he discusses whether the terms of the suffrage law of 1913 and the earlier school suffrage law can be regarded as involving jury duty by statute. He maintains that the school suffrage act could just as well be interpreted to involve this duty as the act of 1913. Says he: "Neither of the acts, granting to women limited suffrage, incorporates into its title anything that relates to jurors or their qualifications, and hence any amendment by implication, to another law then existing, relating to jurors, could not have been in the contemplation of the legislature when they passed these suffrage acts."

The only Illinois Judge who did actually have women jurors was Judge Owens, in cases involving insane women. His juries are described by Minnie F. Low, one of the

jurors. "Judge Owens, then (1913) presiding Judge of the County Court, who was intensely interested in social work, and who felt that women jurors sitting at the hearings of cases of insane women could decide the issues more intelligently, or at least as intelligently, as men, simply took upon himself the responsibility of appointing such women. This was the method of procedure for more than a year, until Judge Owen's term of office expired and he failed to be re-elected. The present Judge sitting in the same court has dispensed with women jurors."

Of the legality of Judge Owen's procedure, the Attorney General has this to say: "I know of no authority in this state which authorizes the empaneling of women as jurors, and I am therefore at a loss to explain the legality of Judge Owen's procedure."

Oregon is another state where the Attorney General interprets the jury law to exclude women. Of the juries of women which sat in that State in the early days of woman suffrage, he says simply that this was done "by agreement of the parties." At present, jurors in Oregon are "male citizens."

No women juries have sat in Wyoming since 1871. In the early days of statehood, Justice Howe frankly took the law into his own hands. He deliberately stretched the right to vote to cover jury duty and drew women on his juries, on the ground that in the outlaw communities of his state, they were the only solid and reliable citizens. His right to women jurors was constantly questioned, and on one occasion a threat was made of carrying a case to the higher court. The Judge pointed out that he himself was on the Supreme Court and that the majority on that Court were in sympathy with his policies. "Well, in that case, your Honor," said the opponent, somewhat grewsomely, "as judges do not resign, there is a possibility of their dying, and all one can do is to wait." Fortunately, it was only illness and not death that brought Judge Howe's services in Wyoming to an end. With his withdrawal, came the end of the Wyoming women jurors.

No Wyoming case has, as in Washington before the new jury law, been decided definitely by the Supreme Court. One male prisoner in that state did demand women jurors, but the court decreed that the question could only be decided *in case a woman demanded trial by her peers.* A woman may make this demand some day, but at the present time the Attorney General of Wyoming defines a juror in his state as "a male citizen of the United States."

A brief table is added showing the practice in the thirteen Equal Suffrage States.

	Jury Service by Women	*Remarks.*
ARIZONA:	*No*	
ALASKA:	*No*	
CALIFORNIA:	*No*	In the early days of woman suffrage local magistrates at San Mateo, etc., without consulting the law, drew women on juries. After this practice was put an end to an effort was made (1915) to pass a law making them eligible, but the bill failed.
COLORADO:	*No*	
IDAHO:	*Compulsory*	"Very rarely indeed do women serve. In practice, if summoned as jurors it is more than likely that the judge would accept an excuse and relieve them from jury duty."—*Attorney General.*
ILLINOIS:	*No*	One Chicago judge, during his year of office, and without consulting official opinion, drew women juries, but the practice has been discontinued.
KANSAS:	*Permitted*	Sex serves as an excuse from jury service.
MONTANA:	*No*	
NEVADA:	*Permitted*	No women have been drawn as yet on Nevada juries.
OREGON:	*No*	In special cases in the early days they were drawn by local magistrates.
UTAH:		Exempted by special statute.
WASHINGTON:	*Permitted*	"Women shall not be compelled to serve." Sec. 2, of Jury Law, 1911.
WYOMING:	*No*	During territorial period and first years of woman suffrage, Justice Howe frequently drew women juries. He was warned that it was unconstitutional and it was discontinued after his resignation.

—:o:—

AN IOWA VICTORY.

Woman suffrage won a great victory on January 26th, when the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa declared, by a vote of 4 to 3, that women were entitled to vote in the election which established the Municipal Court. The story is interesting.

The motion to establish a Municipal Court, calling for the appropriation of public funds was submitted to a city referendum. The women of Iowa, having the right to vote upon public appropriation of funds, voted. The decision to establish the Municipal Court was carried by a small majority and when it was discovered that had the women not voted the question would have been lost, those who opposed the Municipal Court brought a suit to declare the election illegal. The four members of the Supreme Court who prepared the majority opinion expressed their confidence not only in the law but in the principle of woman suffrage, whereupon the three dissenting members were quoted in Iowa papers as being antis. They hastened to defend themselves against this accusation with the result that it is now known that the seven members of the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa all stand for woman suffrage.

—:o:—

LITERATURE AND PROPAGANDA.

You will be glad to know that revised editions of two most useful pamphlets, containing the very latest data, are just off the press:

EFFECT OF VOTE, 5c. ea., 40c. doz., $2.65 hundred.

CHIVALRY vs. JUSTICE, 3c. each, 30c. dozen, $2.00 hundred.

(*These price are postpaid*)

"BABY FLYERS."

These revised *Eastern Campaign Flyers* are meeting *general* success. They supplement the Rainbow Series, and are cheaper and smaller in size. The Baby Flyers are printed on purple, white, and yellow paper, in the following titles:

"THE MAP PROVES IT," "WHO REPRESENTS HER," "THE NEXT PRESIDENT," "FACTS WORTH KNOWING," "TRUE DEMOCRACY," "WOMEN IN THE HOME," "WOMEN *DO* WANT THE VOTE," "ISN'T IT TRUE?" "TWELVE REASONS WHY WOMEN SHOULD VOTE."

Price: 55c. a thousand, $2.50 for five thousand, $4.75 for ten thousand. Postage extra (*Write for free sample set.*)

WHY NOT MAKE SUFFRAGE MONEY SELLING PINS?

The new National emblem offers you an opportunity to realize $10.00 profit on each hundred sold. The pins are of gilt over sterling silver, a neatly designed circlet of Royal Blue enamel with the words "Votes for Women," and in the center a modeled figure of Justice.

Price: 35c. each; $3.50 dozen; $25 per hundred.

Write to

National Woman Suffrage Publishing Co., Inc.

171 MADISON AVE., NEW YORK CITY